UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,819	06/02/2006	Pierre Jurdic	0070663-000003	9643
	7590 05/11/201 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	NGUYEN, QUANG		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1633		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/11/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com offserv@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/559,819	JURDIC ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	QUANG NGUTEN, FILD.	1633						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 04 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,								
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	•							
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		E below);						
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet 	•	lucina or cimplifyina t	a inques for					
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	rucing or simplifying the	ie issues ioi					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	kplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,17 and 20</u> .								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-0,17 and 20.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>7-14,16,18,19 and 10.</u>	d 21.							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	 -							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ((PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13. Other:								
	/QUANG NGUYEN/							
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1633						
	= · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed independent claim 1 recites new limitations "at a density of 10 cells/mm2" and "differentiated osteoclasts", which would require further consideration and/or search. For example, what is encompassed by the limitation "differentiated osteoclasts" versus the normal term "osteoclasts" known in the priro art.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is noted that with respect to the prior art rejections of record, Applicants' arguments are directly mainly to the new limitation "differentiated osteoclasts deposited on said osteoblast layer and/or nodule at a density of 10 cells/mm2"; but these arguments are moot since proposed new claims were not entered for the reasons discussed above. Additionally, it is also noted that other related arguments with respect to the prior art rejections have been adequately addressed in Examiner's responses to Applicants' arguments in the Final office action mailed on 1/4/2010. With rspect to the 112, second paragraph rejection for the term "normal", it is withdrawn; and therefore Applicant's arguments are moot.